Setting the Stage

Modern Modal Logic began with C.I. Lewis' dissatisfaction with the material conditional ($\rightarrow$).

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

X	Y	$X \to Y$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$$

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

X	Y	$X \to Y$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray, my prayers will be answered

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

X	Y	$X \to Y$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$$
$$\neg P$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray, my prayers will be answered

I don't pray

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

P	A	$P \to A$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$$
$$\neg P$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray,
my prayers will be answered
I don't pray

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

$\neg G$	$\neg(P \to A)$	$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\neg G \to \overbrace{\underset{\neg P}{\neg(P \to A)}}^{F}$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray,
my prayers will be answered
I don't pray

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

$\neg G$	$\neg(P \rightarrow A)$	$\neg G \rightarrow \neg(P \rightarrow A)$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\overbrace{\neg G}^{F} \rightarrow \overbrace{\neg(P \rightarrow A)}^{F}$$

$$\neg P$$

$$G$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray,
my prayers will be answered
I don't pray

Dorothy Edgington's Proof of the Existence of God

$\neg G$	$\neg(P \to A)$	$\neg G \to \neg(P \to A)$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$$\frac{\overbrace{\neg G}^{F} \to \overbrace{\neg(P \to A)}^{F} \qquad \neg P}{G}$$

If God does not exist, then it's not the case that if I pray,
my prayers will be answered
I don't pray

God exists!

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"
Judge: "I agree with the defense."

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"
Judge: "I agree with the defense."

Prosecutor: $G \to A$
Defense: $\neg(G \to A)$
Judge: $\neg(G \to A)$

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"
Judge: "I agree with the defense."

Prosecutor: $G \to A$
Defense: $\neg(G \to A)$
Judge: $\neg(G \to A)$ $\Leftrightarrow G \land \neg A$, therefore G!

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"
Judge: "I agree with the defense."

Prosecutor: $\Box(G \to A)$ (It is necessarily the case that ...)
Defense: $\neg\Box(G \to A)$
Judge: $\neg\Box(G \to A)$ (*What can the Judge conclude?*)

Setting the Stage

C.I. Lewis' idea: Interpret 'If A then B' as 'It **must** be the case that A implies B', or 'It is **necessarily** the case that A implies B'

Prosecutor: "If Eric is guilty then he had an accomplice."
Defense: "I disagree!"
Judge: "I agree with the defense."

Prosecutor: $\Box(G \to A)$ (It is necessarily the case that ...)
Defense: $\neg\Box(G \to A)$
Judge: $\neg\Box(G \to A)$ (*What can the Judge conclude?*)

Gradually, the study of the modalities themselves became dominant, with the study of "implication" developing into a separate topic.

Setting the Stage

$\Box\varphi$: "It is *necessarily* the case that φ" ("It must be that φ")

$\Diamond\varphi$: "It is *possible* that φ" ("It can/might be that φ")

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of "Possibility"

- I can come to the party, but I cant stay late. ("is not inconvenient")

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of “Possibility”

- I can come to the party, but I cant stay late. (“is not inconvenient”)
- Humans can travel to the moon, but not Mars. (“is achievable with current technology”)

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of "Possibility"

- I can come to the party, but I cant stay late. ("is not inconvenient")
- Humans can travel to the moon, but not Mars. ("is achievable with current technology")
- Its possible to move almost as fast as the speed of light, but not to travel faster than light. ("is consistent with the laws of nature")

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of "Possibility"

- I can come to the party, but I can't stay late. ("is not inconvenient")
- Humans can travel to the moon, but not Mars. ("is achievable with current technology")
- It's possible to move almost as fast as the speed of light, but not to travel faster than light. ("is consistent with the laws of nature")
- Objects could have traveled faster than the speed of light (if the laws of nature had been different), but no matter what the laws had been, nothing could have traveled faster than itself. ("metaphysical possibility")

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of "Possibility"

- I can come to the party, but I cant stay late. ("is not inconvenient")
- Humans can travel to the moon, but not Mars. ("is achievable with current technology")
- Its possible to move almost as fast as the speed of light, but not to travel faster than light. ("is consistent with the laws of nature")
- Objects could have traveled faster than the speed of light (if the laws of nature had been different), but no matter what the laws had been, nothing could have traveled faster than itself. ("metaphysical possibility")
- You may borrow but you may not steal. ("morally acceptable")

Setting the Stage: Different Senses of “Possibility”

- I can come to the party, but I cant stay late. (“is not inconvenient”)
- Humans can travel to the moon, but not Mars. (“is achievable with current technology”)
- Its possible to move almost as fast as the speed of light, but not to travel faster than light. (“is consistent with the laws of nature”)
- Objects could have traveled faster than the speed of light (if the laws of nature had been different), but no matter what the laws had been, nothing could have traveled faster than itself. (“metaphysical possibility”)
- You may borrow but you may not steal. (“morally acceptable”)
- It might rain tomorrow (“epistemic possibility”)

The History of Modal Logic

R. Goldblatt. *Mathematical Modal Logic: A View of its Evolution*. Handbook of the History of Logic, Vol. 7, 2006.

P. Balckburn, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema. *Modal Logic*. Section 1.7, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

R. Ballarin. *Modern Origins of Modal Logic*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2010.

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly
- is known/believed/certain (by Ann) to be

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly
- is known/believed/certain (by Ann) to be
- is permitted to be
- is obliged to be

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly
- is known/believed/certain (by Ann) to be
- is permitted to be
- is obliged to be
- is now
- will be

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John _______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly
- is known/believed/certain (by Ann) to be
- is permitted to be
- is obliged to be
- is now
- will be
- can do something to ensure that he is

What is a modal?

A **modality** is any word or phrase that can be applied to a given states S to create a new statement that makes an assertion about the mode of truth of S.

John ______ happy.

- is necessarily
- is possibly
- is known/believed/certain (by Ann) to be
- is permitted to be
- is obliged to be
- is now
- will be
- can do something to ensure that he is
- ...

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,...

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,. . .

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,. . .

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

doxastic: it is believed that

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,...

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

doxastic: it is believed that

deontic: it is obligatory/forbidden/permitted/unlawful that

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,. . .

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

doxastic: it is believed that

deontic: it is obligatory/forbidden/permitted/unlawful that

dynamic: after the program/computation/action finishes, the program enables, throughout the computation

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,. . .

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

doxastic: it is believed that

deontic: it is obligatory/forbidden/permitted/unlawful that

dynamic: after the program/computation/action finishes, the program enables, throughout the computation

geometric: it is locally the case that

Types of Modal Logics

tense: henceforth, eventually, hitherto, deviously, now, tomorrow, yesterday, since, until, inevitably, finally, ultimately, endlessly, it will have been, it is being,. . .

epistemic: it is known to *a* that, it is common knowledge that

doxastic: it is believed that

deontic: it is obligatory/forbidden/permitted/unlawful that

dynamic: after the program/computation/action finishes, the program enables, throughout the computation

geometric: it is locally the case that

metalogic: it is valid/satisfiable/provable/consistent that

The Basic Modal Language

A formula of Modal Logic is defined *inductively*:

1. Any atomic propositional variable is a formula
2. If P and Q are formula, then so are $\neg P$, $P \wedge Q$, $P \vee Q$ and $P \rightarrow Q$
3. If P is a formula, then so is $\Box P$ and $\Diamond P$

The Basic Modal Language

A formula of Modal Logic is defined *inductively*:

1. Any atomic propositional variable is a formula
2. If P and Q are formula, then so are $\neg P$, $P \wedge Q$, $P \vee Q$ and $P \rightarrow Q$
3. If P is a formula, then so is $\Box P$ and $\Diamond P$

Boolean Logic

The Basic Modal Language

A formula of Modal Logic is defined *inductively*:

1. Any atomic propositional variable is a formula
2. If P and Q are formula, then so are $\neg P$, $P \wedge Q$, $P \vee Q$ and $P \rightarrow Q$
3. If P is a formula, then so is $\Box P$ and $\Diamond P$

Unary operator

The Basic Modal Language

A formula of Modal Logic is defined *inductively*:

1. Any atomic propositional variable is a formula
2. If P and Q are formula, then so are $\neg P$, $P \wedge Q$, $P \vee Q$ and $P \rightarrow Q$
3. If P is a formula, then so is $\Box P$ and $\Diamond P$

Eg., $\Box(P \rightarrow \Diamond Q) \vee \Box\Diamond\neg R$

Modal Formulas: $\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi$

$\neg(\Box\varphi \to \psi)$

$\neg\Box(\varphi \to \psi)$

$(\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi)$

Modal Formulas: $\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi$

$\neg(\Box\varphi \to \psi)$

$\neg\Box(\varphi \to \psi)$

$(\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi)$



Modal Formulas: $\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi$

$\neg(\Box\varphi \to \psi)$



$\neg\Box(\varphi \to \psi)$



$(\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi)$

Modal Formulas: $\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi$

$\neg(\Box\varphi \to \psi)$



$\neg\Box(\varphi \to \psi)$



$(\neg\Box\varphi \to \psi)$



Narrow vs. Wide Scope

"If you do p, you must also do q"

- $p \to \Box q$
- $\Box(p \to q)$

Narrow vs. Wide Scope

"If you do p, you must also do q"

- $p \to \Box q$
- $\Box(p \to q)$

"If Bob is a bachelor, then he is necessarily unmarried"

- $B \to \Box U$
- $\Box(B \to U)$

de dicto vs. de re

"I know that someone appreciates me"

- $\Box\exists x A(x, e)$ (*de dicto*)
- $\exists x \Box A(x, e)$ (*de re*)

Iterations of Modal Operators

$\Box\varphi \to \Box\Box\varphi$: If I know, do I know that I know?

$\neg\Box\varphi \to \Box\neg\Box\varphi$: If I don't know, do I know that I don't know?

- Modal reasoning patterns
- Formal modeling

Deontic Logic

OA means A is obligatory
PA means A is permitted

Deontic Logic

OA means A is obligatory
PA means A is permitted

Is the following argument valid?

$$\frac{\text{If } A \text{ then } B \ (A \rightarrow B)}{\text{If } A \text{ is obligatory then so is } B \ (OA \rightarrow OB)}$$

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \rightarrow OG$)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \rightarrow OG$)

? Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

✓ Jones murders Smith. (M)

✓ If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \to OG$)

3. Jones ought to murder Smith gently. (OG)

? Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \to OG$)
3. Jones ought to murder Smith gently. (OG)

$\Rightarrow$ If Jones murders Smith gently, then Jones murders Smith. ($G \to M$)

? Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \rightarrow OG$)
3. Jones ought to murder Smith gently. (OG)

✓ If Jones murders Smith gently, then Jones murders Smith. ($G \rightarrow M$)

(Mon) If Jones ought to murder Smith gently, then Jones ought to murder Smith. ($OG \rightarrow OM$)

? Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \to OG$)

✓ Jones ought to murder Smith gently. (OG)

4. If Jones murders Smith gently, then Jones murders Smith. ($G \to M$)

✓ If Jones ought to murder Smith gently, then Jones ought to murder Smith. ($OG \to OM$)

? Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Deontic Logic

1. Jones murders Smith. (M)
2. If Jones murders Smith, then Jones ought to murder Smith gently. ($M \rightarrow OG$)
3. Jones ought to murder Smith gently. (OG)
4. If Jones murders Smith gently, then Jones murders Smith. ($G \rightarrow M$)
5. If Jones ought to murder Smith gently, then Jones ought to murder Smith. ($OG \rightarrow OM$)
6. Jones ought to murder Smith. (OM)

(first discussed by J. Forrester in 1984)

Actions

1. Actions as *transitions between states, or situations*:

Actions

1. Actions as *transitions between states, or situations*:



Actions

1. Actions as *transitions between states, or situations*:



2. Actions *restrict* the set of possible future histories.



J. van Benthem, H. van Ditmarsch, J. van Eijck and J. Jaspers. *Chapter 6: Propositional Dynamic Logic*. Logic in Action Online Course Project, 2011.

Examples



Examples


alarm on
toggle
alarm off


alarm on
toggle
alarm off
toggle
alarm on

Examples



Examples




s
s_1
s_2
s_3
s_n

Semantics for Propositional Modal Logic

1. Relational semantics (i.e., Kripke semantics)
2. Algebraic semantics (BAO: Boolean algebras with operators)
3. Topological semantics (Closure algebras)
4. Category-theoretic (Coalgebras)

Semantics for Propositional Modal Logic

1. Relational semantics (i.e., Kripke semantics)
2. Algebraic semantics (BAO: Boolean algebras with operators)
3. Topological semantics (Closure algebras)
4. Category-theoretic (Coalgebras)

Kripke Structures

Kripke Structures

The main idea:

- ‘It is sunny outside’ is currently true

Kripke Structures

The main idea:

- 'It is sunny outside' is currently true, but it is not necessary (for example, if we were currently in Amsterdam).

Kripke Structures

The main idea:

- 'It is sunny outside' is currently true, but it is not necessary (for example, if we were currently in Amsterdam).

- We say φ is **necessary** provided φ is true in all (relevant) situations (states, worlds, possibilities).

Kripke Structures

The main idea:

- 'It is sunny outside' is currently true, but it is not necessary (for example, if we were currently in Amsterdam).

- We say φ is **necessary** provided φ is true in all (relevant) situations (states, worlds, possibilities).

- A **Kripke structure** is
  1. A set of states, or worlds (each world specifies the truth value of all propositional variables)
  2. A **relation** on the set of states (specifying the "relevant situations")

A Kripke Structure



1. Set of states

A Kripke Structure



1. Set of states (propositional valuations)

A Kripke Structure



1. Set of states (propositional valuations)
2. Accessibility relation

A Kripke Structure



1. Set of states (propositional valuations)
2. Accessibility relation

denoted $w_3 R w_5$

Truth of Modal Formulas

Model: $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, V \rangle$ where $W \neq \emptyset$, $R \subseteq W \times W$ and $V : \text{At} \to \wp(W)$ (At is the set of atomic propositions).

Truth of Modal Formulas

Model: $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, R, V \rangle$ where $W \neq \emptyset$, $R \subseteq W \times W$ and $V : \text{At} \to \wp(W)$ (At is the set of atomic propositions).

Truth at a state in a model: $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$

- $\mathcal{M}, w \models p$ iff $w \in V(p)$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \neg\varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi \wedge \psi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ and $\mathcal{M}, w \models \psi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Box\varphi$ iff for all $v \in W$, if wRv then $\mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \Diamond\varphi$ iff there is a $v \in W$ such that $\mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi$

Example



Example



$w_4 \models B \wedge C$

Example



$w_3 \models \Box B$

Example



$w_3 \models \Box B$

Example



$w_3 \models \Diamond C$

Example



$w_3 \models \Diamond C$

Example



$w_3 \not\models \Box C$

Example



$w_3 \not\models \Box C$

Example



$w_1 \models \Diamond\Box B$

Example



$w_1 \models \Diamond\Box B$

Example



$w_1 \models \Diamond\Box B$

Example



$w_5 \models \Box C$

Example



$w_5 \models \Box(B \land \neg B)$

Example



$w_5 \models \neg\Diamond B$



$w_1 \models \Box B \wedge B$?

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$?

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$?

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$?

$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond C$?

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$?



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \land B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$?

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$?

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$?

$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond C$?

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$?



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B?$

$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond C?$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C?$



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond C?$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C?$



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond C?$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C?$



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \land B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond C$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$?



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond C$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$?



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond C$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$



$w_1 \not\models \Box B \wedge B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond B$

$w_1 \models \Box\Box B$

$w_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond C$

$w_1 \models \Diamond\Diamond C$

$\Box(A \to B)$ vs. $A \to \Box B$



$\Box(A \to B)$ vs. $A \to \Box B$



$w \models X \to Y$ provided either $w \not\models X$ or $w \models Y$

$\Box(A \to B)$ vs. $A \to \Box B$



$w_1 \models \Box(A \to B)$

$w \models X \to Y$ provided either $w \not\models X$ or $w \models Y$

$\Box(A \to B)$ vs. $A \to \Box B$



$w_1 \models \Box(A \to B)$

$w \models X \to Y$ provided either $w \not\models X$ or $w \models Y$

$\Box(A \to B)$ vs. $A \to \Box B$



$w_1 \models \Box(A \to B)$ and $w_1 \not\models A \to \Box B$

$w \models X \to Y$ provided either $w \not\models X$ or $w \models Y$

Some Facts

- $\Box\varphi \vee \neg\Box\varphi$ is always true (i.e., true at any state in any Kripke structure), but what about $\Box\varphi \vee \Box\neg\varphi$?

Some Facts

- $\Box\varphi \vee \neg\Box\varphi$ is always true (i.e., true at any state in any Kripke structure), but what about $\Box\varphi \vee \Box\neg\varphi$?
- $\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi \to \Box(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure.

Some Facts

- $\Box\varphi \vee \neg\Box\varphi$ is always true (i.e., true at any state in any Kripke structure), but what about $\Box\varphi \vee \Box\neg\varphi$?

- $\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi \to \Box(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure. What about $\Box(\varphi \vee \psi) \to \Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi$?

Some Facts

- $\Box\varphi \vee \neg\Box\varphi$ is always true (i.e., true at any state in any Kripke structure), but what about $\Box\varphi \vee \Box\neg\varphi$?
- $\Box\varphi \wedge \Box\psi \to \Box(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure. What about $\Box(\varphi \vee \psi) \to \Box\varphi \vee \Box\psi$?
- $\Box\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\Diamond\neg\varphi$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure.

More Facts

Determine which of the following formulas are *always* true at any state in any Kripke structure:

1. $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\varphi$
2. $\Box(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi)$
3. $\Box(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Box\psi)$
4. $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$
5. $P \rightarrow \Box\Diamond\varphi$
6. $\Diamond(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \Diamond\varphi \vee \Diamond\psi$

But, we are not always interested in all Kripke structures.

But, we are not always interested in all Kripke structures.

For example, consider the epistemic interpretation: A state v is accessible from w (wRv) provided "given the agents information, w and v are indistinguishable".

But, we are not always interested in all Kripke structures.

For example, consider the epistemic interpretation: A state v is accessible from w (wRv) provided "given the agents information, w and v are indistinguishable". What are natural properties?

But, we are not always interested in all Kripke structures.

For example, consider the epistemic interpretation: A state v is accessible from w (wRv) provided "given the agents information, w and v are indistinguishable". What are natural properties?

Eg., for each state w, w is accessible from itself (R is a reflexive relation).

But, we are not always interested in all Kripke structures.

For example, consider the epistemic interpretation: A state v is accessible from w (wRv) provided "given the agents information, w and v are indistinguishable". What are natural properties?

Eg., for each state w, w is accessible from itself (R is a reflexive relation).

Some Facts

- $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure where each state is accessible from itself.
- $\Box\varphi \rightarrow \Diamond\varphi$ is true at any state in any Kripke structure where each state has at least one accessible world.

Can you think of properties that force each of the following formulas to be true at any state in any appropriate Kripke structure?

1. $\Diamond\varphi \to \Box\varphi$
2. $\Box\varphi \to \Box\Box\varphi$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models$
- $w_3 \models$
- $w_2 \models$
- $w_1 \models$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models$
- $w_2 \models$
- $w_1 \models$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_2 \models$
- $w_1 \models$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \land \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_2 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \land \Diamond\Diamond\top$
- $w_1 \models$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_2 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Diamond\Diamond\top$
- $w_1 \models \Diamond(\Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot)$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_2 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_1 \models \Diamond(\Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot)$

Defining States



- $w_4 \models \Box\bot$
- $w_3 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot$
- $w_2 \models \Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Diamond\Diamond\top$
- $w_1 \models \Diamond(\Diamond\Box\bot \wedge \Box\Box\bot)$

Distinguishing States



What is the difference between states w_1 and v_1?

Distinguishing States



What is the difference between states w_1 and v_1?

Distinguishing States



Is there a modal formula true at w_1 but not at v_1?

Distinguishing States



$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond\neg A$ but $v_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond\neg A$.

Distinguishing States



$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond\neg A$ but $v_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond\neg A$.

Distinguishing States



$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond\neg A$ but $v_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond\neg A$.

Distinguishing States



$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond\neg A$ but $v_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond\neg A$.

Distinguishing States



$w_1 \models \Box\Diamond\neg A$ but $v_1 \not\models \Box\Diamond\neg A$.

Distinguishing States



What about now? Is there a modal formula true at w_1 but not v_1?

Distinguishing States



No modal formula can distinguish w_1 and v_1!

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\mathbb{K}$ $\mathbb{M}$ $\mathbb{N}$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \lor \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?



$\Box(\Box\bot \vee \Diamond\Box\bot)$

A More Complicated Example

Which pair of states cannot be distinguished by a modal formula?




THREE LOGICIANS WALK INTO A BAR...
DOES EVERYONE WANT BEER?
spikedmath.com © 2011
I DON'T KNOW.
I DON'T KNOW.
YES!

States

States

Logician 1 wants a beer


Logician 1 wants a beer
Logician 2 does not want a beer

States


Logician 3 wants a beer
Logician 1 wants a beer
Logician 2 does not want a beer

A Model of the Logicians' Information



A Model of the Logicians' Information



A Model of the Logicians' Information



A Model of the Logicians' Information



Logician 1: “I don’t know”

Logician 1: "I don't know"



Logician 1: “I don’t know”



Logician 2: "I don't know"



Logician 2: "I don't know"



Logician 3: "Yes!"



Next time: Chapters 3 & 4.

Questions?

Email: epacuit@umd.edu
Website: ai.stanford.edu/~epacuit
Office: Skinner 1103A